

Index to Minutes of Meeting of
19 January 1960

American Battle Monuments Commission	
✓ Sculpture for Memorial Building in Honolulu, Hawaii	8
Budget Estimates for 1961	1
✓ Legislation to increase the limit of authorization	1
Byrd Memorial, Admiral Richard E.	
✓ Status of Plans for	8
✓ <i>Bus Turn-around and Terminal</i>	7
Dalecarlia Reservoir	
✓ Addition to Filtration Plant and Chemical Bldg.	7
✓ Delano, William Adams - death	2
✓ Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	
Proposed building	6
✓ Federal Highway Act of 1956	
Report on amendment	2
✓ Fiftieth Anniversary	
Report of Commission of Fine Arts	1
✓ Inner Loop, West Leg of	
studies being developed	5
✓ Labor Department Building	
Penthouse design	6
✓ Land Acquisition, National Capital Planning Commission	
Petworth School Playground	4
Legislation	
✓ H.J.Res. 543/86th-living memorials to past presidents	8
S.J.Res. 147 and	
H.R. 544-86th -extending authority of Commission to	
Metropolitan Area	8
Draft legislation	
Proposed joint resolution-National Capital	
Planning Commission reserving public open	
space between E Street and Constitution	
Avenue, 23rd and 25th Streets	9
Bureau of the Budget-proposed bill to develop	
a unified system of transportation and to	
create a National Capital Transportation	
Corporation	9

✓ Paint Color for ironwork of bridges	5
Public Law 808-Old Georgetown Act	
Confirmation on actions taken	3
✓ Attorney General's Review of Corporation Counsel's Opinion	3
✓ Refrigeration Plant for Federal Triangle	7
✓ Rochambeau Bridge, color of paint for ironwork	5
✓ Roosevelt Memorial, Franklin Delano Progress Report	7
Saint Elizabeth's Hospital	
✓ Administration Building	6
✓ Treatment and Cafeteria Building	6
Shipstead-Luce Act	
✓ Confirmation of actions taken on appendix 1	2
✓ Status of appeal by Albert Dance Studios, SL 2178	3
✓ Enterprise Federal Savings and Loan	3
✓ Enlargement of boundaries	3
✓ Street Lighting in the District of Columbia Program for improving	5
✓ Theodore Roosevelt Bridge Design for four overpasses on approach roads	4

MEMORANDUM MINUTES OF THE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
19 January 1960

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 3:00 P.M. with David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

Present were:

David E. Finley, Chairman
Ralph W. Walker
Michael Rapuano
Peter Hurd
Felix W. deWeldon
William G. Perry

L. R. Wilson, Secretary
Susan E. Bennett, Adm. Asst.
Gilbert E. Halasz, Stenotypist

I. ADMINISTRATION:

1. The date of the next meeting was confirmed for the afternoon of 16 February and the morning of 17 February 1960, with the sessions starting at 3:00 P.M. and 9:30 A.M. respectively.

2. The minutes of the November meeting were approved and the minutes of the December meeting were distributed for approval and correction.

3. Budget Estimates, Fiscal Year 1961: The Secretary reported that \$69,000 had been requested and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, to provide for two more positions for the Commission, one for an architectural assistant and the other for a drafting assistant with legal background. Hearings before the House Appropriations Committee have been scheduled for Thursday, January 21. The Chairman and the Secretary were to attend.

He also reported that a bill, S. 2778, had been introduced in the Senate by Senator Hennings, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which would fix the limit of authorization for the Commission at \$100,000. H.J.Res. 544, which was introduced in the House of Representatives by Frank Thompson, Jr. provides for no fixed limit. It was hoped that action on both bills could be taken before adjournment of the Congress. (EXHIBITS A and B)

4. Fiftieth Anniversary Report of the Commission of Fine Arts:
The Secretary reported that Mr. Caemmerer, the former Secretary

of the Commission, had prepared during the summer, at the request of the Chairman, a draft outline for a 50th anniversary report of the Commission of Fine Arts. The 50th anniversary of the Commission will fall on 17 May 1960, and the members considered that it was desirable to have a report in print by that time, if practicable. The Chairman said that there was considerable work to be done on the manuscript, but that it would be made ready if possible.

5. Resolution Proposing Amendment of the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

The Chairman reported that he had written a letter to the Secretary of Commerce, urging that, if necessary, the Federal Highway Act of 1956 be amended, to waive the standard requirements for roadways and overpasses in the city of Washington. A copy of the resolution which was formulated on this subject during the course of the December meeting was attached. To date no reply has been received from the Secretary of Commerce. The members again stressed the need for bringing to the attention of the public, the threat which the highway program held to the parks and streets of the District of Columbia. (EXHIBIT C)

6. Death of William Delano, Former Member of the Commission of Fine Arts:

The Secretary informed the members that a telegram of sympathy had been sent to Mr. Delano's widow and son. The Chairman expressed surprise that the death of an architect of Mr. Delano's prominence had not been the subject of an editorial comment in the newspapers, and hoped that appropriate notice would be taken. The members of the Commission passed a resolution of regret, at Mr. Delano's death.

(EXHIBIT L)

II. SUBMISSIONS:

1. Government of the District of Columbia

a. Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Building Applications Submitted Under the Shipstead-Luce Act Since 15 December 1959.

The Secretary reported the actions taken, after recommendations of the Shipstead-Luce Panel of Architects, on the Shipstead-Luce Building applications forwarded for review by the D.C. Department of Licenses and Inspections since 15 December 1959. This report was dated 19 January 1960 and comprised Appendix 1 of the order of business. After discussion, the action as noted in Appendix 1 was confirmed by the members, and action was taken on the following cases, which had been held for their review.

S.L. 2242 - 125 Indiana Avenue, S.E. - Remodel facade of building for shop

S.L. 2243 - 7201 16th Street, N.W. - Construct frame addition at rear of dwelling

The Secretary was directed to include actions for the above cases and to forward a copy of Appendix 1 officially to the Secretary of the District Commissioners for record. (EXHIBIT D)

(2) S.L. 2178, Status of Appeal by Applicant:

The Secretary reported that the legality of the present boundaries of the Shipstead-Luce Area were to be reviewed by the Corporation Counsel as the result of action on an appeal to the D.C. Board of Appeals and Review by the Albert Dance Studios, protesting the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts to review a design for a sign. There was a possibility that the Corporation Counsel would rule that referral of certain applications to the Commission under the Shipstead-Luce Act for the past 28 years have been made without proper authority; and that Congressional action would be necessary to revise the enlarge the boundaries, as the Commission requested in a letter to the Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Commissioners, 6 May 1959.

(3) Enterprise Federal Savings and Loan, Proposed Remodelling of Buildings at 813-815 Market Space, N.W.

The Secretary presented a revised drawing which had been prepared by the architect as a result of recommendations by the Commission of Fine Arts at its December meeting. The members of the Commission considered the new design to be an improvement over the one previously submitted, but it still left much to be desired in the wall treatment and the sign. A letter was written to the Chief of the Permit Branch outlining the Commission's views. (EXHIBIT E)

(4) Building Applications Submitted Under the Old-Georgetown Act Since 15 December 1959:

The Secretary reported the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Act Applications forwarded for review by the D.C. Department of Licenses and Inspections since 15 December 1959. This report was dated 20 January 1960 and Comprised Appendix 2 of the order of business. After discussion, action as noted on Appendix 2 was taken by the members on the following cases, which had been held for their review.

O.G. 2513 - 1212 30th Street, N.W. - Replace existing cast iron steps with brick steps.

O.G. 2516 - 1522 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. - new building

O.G. 2518 - 1401 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. - new building

The Secretary was directed to include action, as noted thereon, for the above cases and to forward a copy of Appendix 2 officially to the Secretary of the District of Columbia commissioners for record.

(EXHIBIT F)

(5) Public Law 808/81st Congress, Attorney General's Review of D.C. Corporation Counsel's Opinion:

The Chairman reported that the Attorney General had reviewed the Corporation Counsel's Opinion and had advised the President in a Statement that he agreed with the Commission of Fine Arts' liberal construction of the Georgetown Act, rather than the strict interpretation of the Corporation Counsel. In the opinion of the Attorney General, the Act included new construction as well as preservation and reconstruction, and it also included signs, walls, fences and other structures visible from the street.

The Secretary said that he had been advised by the Chief of the Permit Branch that he had been directed by the D.C. Commissioners to send all applications to the Commission of Fine Arts for review, thus revoking the D.C. Corporation Counsel's opinion which had been in effect since October 1958.]

The Chairman stated that the Attorney General's opinion was encouraging, not only to the Commission in the administration of the Old Georgetown Act, but was of great importance in the entire movement for historic preservation. The Chairman further stated that the former members of the Old Georgetown panel would be invited again to serve and weekly meetings for review of applications would again be scheduled. It was suggested that this new Georgetown Board be invited to meet with the other members of the Commission of Fine Arts, possibly at the meeting in February.

(EXHIBIT G)

(SEE CORPORATION COUNSEL'S OPINION -
19 NOV 58)

b. Department of Highways and Traffic

(1) Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, Four Overpass Structures on D. C. Approach to:

Drawings were on view showing the elevations of four overpasses. The structures had been designed by Modjeski and Masters, Engineers, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, Architects. They were faced with limestone and ashlar, and the members considered them well-designed and handsome in themselves. No overall plan was furnished, so that it was impossible to determine where the structures fitted into the roadway scheme. The secretary stated that he had asked for an overall plan, and, if possible, a model of the entire area. Such a model had recently been made public by the Director of Highways. It was hoped that this material would be made available for the meeting on the following day.

Concern for the effect of this roadway development on the park lands and memorials in this area was expressed, and the Chairman read the draft of a statement, prepared by Mr. Rapuano and himself, as the result of new discussions regarding the Inner Loop and the approaches to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. It again seemed necessary to make the position of the Commission clear, and the statement stressed the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on the impingement of roadways

on park lands in the city of Washington, and deplored the fact that this network of roadways would detract from the Lincoln Memorial and the proposed Cultural Center. Further discussion was reserved for the next day, with representatives of the D.C. Highway Department.

(2) Inner Loop, West Leg:

The Secretary reported that study of the Commission's recommendations for changes in the general layout of the West Leg of the Inner Loop, were still being developed by the Director of Highways. It was understood that he would be prepared to discuss the results of his study the following day. No drawings had yet been presented for review.

(3) Rochambeau Bridge, Color of Paint for Ironwork:

The Chairman read a letter from Mr. Henry R. Shepley to the D.C. Board of Commissioners stating his preference that the iron work on the Rochambeau Bridge be painted grey to match the piers, instead of green, and citing the Commission of Fine Arts as having favored green. The members of the Commission agreed that they would not object to painting the Washington bridges in shades of grey, in order to harmonize with the stone piers. It was decided to discuss the matter further with the representatives of the D.C. Highway Department at the meeting on the following day.

(4) Street Lighting in the District of Columbia,
Program for Improving:

The Secretary reported receipt from the Director of Highways and Traffic of a program to improve the street lighting in the District of Columbia and a notice setting February 8 as the time for a public hearing on this Program. The Secretary and Chairman of the Commission had been shown the charts compiled for this purpose in the office of the D.C. Director of Highways and Traffic, and the Director had explained his intentions. It was noted that greater use would be made of lighting standards which the Commission of Fine Arts had recommended previously only for highway lighting in outlying districts and not for use in the city itself. It was decided that a resolution would be drafted urging that the present lighting standards be maintained in the monumental areas of the city and in Georgetown; and that a new design for lighting standards be prepared for Washington; and that in carrying out the lighting program the trees in the city be preserved at all costs. Further discussion was reserved for the following day with members of the D. C. Highway Department.

2. General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service

a. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Proposed Building:

Designs for a proposed headquarters building to house the offices of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation were on view for study. The proposed location was the eastern end of Square 170, and the building was to extend over an area bounded by New York Avenue, 17th and F Streets, N.W. The members of the Commission felt that the marked verticality of the design for the proposed building, and its massing, were not in harmony with the character of the buildings now standing from Constitution Avenue to New York Avenue, nor the Old State, War and Navy Building. A different architectural expression was needed.

The location of this quasi-governmental office here caused some wonder because it had been expected that this site would be preserved as a logical place for the expansion of the Executive Office of the President, or a closely related agency.

Further comments were reserved for the following day in discussion with representatives of General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service.

St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Treatment & Cafeteria Building:

b. The members viewed designs for a new treatment and cafeteria building for Saint Elizabeth's Hospital. They found the designs designers development of the architecture suitable in general. Further discussion was withheld until the meeting on the following day.

c. St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Administration Building, Additions:

The members also viewed designs for additions to the present administration building at St. Elizabeth's Hospital. The development of the architecture was suitable and in harmony with the existing building. Further discussion was withheld until the meeting on the following day.

d. Proposed Labor Department Building, 6th and C Streets, N.W., Penthouse for:

No changes had been made in the design and the same drawings were again on view which the Commission had reviewed in December. The Chairman read a letter which had been written after that meeting to the Commissioner of Public Buildings Service, recommending that the roof structure be screened by a free-standing, wall-like structure which would serve to connect the roof level of the existing building with this new roof structure in a continuous line. In reply, a letter had been received from Mr. L. L. Hunter, Assistant Commissioner for Design and Construction, in which he stated his objections to carrying out the Commission's proposal. The members reviewed the Commission's position on having buildings whose roof silhouettes were

unbroken, and felt that this penthouse was a case in point. Further comment on the matter was reserved for discussion with the representatives of Public Buildings Service, at the meeting on the following day.

e. Federal Triangle Area Refrigeration Plant:

A drawing was on view showing the proposed structure and the latest scheme for the bus turnaround in the Great Plaza. The Commission of Fine Arts had already given its approval to the location of the proposed Federal Triangle Area Refrigeration Plant, with a strong recommendation not to attempt to include the bus turnaround in this important area. The members once more reiterated their strong disapproval of plans to include the bus turnaround, in any form, because it will restrict total development of the Great Plaza as the park for which it was intended. Further discussion was withheld for the meeting on the following day.

3. U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer:

Dalecarlia Reservoir, Addition to Filtration Plant and Chemical Building.

The general plot plan and photographs of the existing structure at the Dalecarlia Reservoir were on view with drawings for the proposed addition. The members expressed the hope that the additions, which were of considerable size, could be of the same quality of design as the original structures. They felt that this had only partially been accomplished and that further study was needed to bring the new building into closer harmony with the existing parts. They also felt that the roof structures on the chemical building, should be incorporated within the main mass of the building. Further discussion was reserved for the meeting on the following day, when representatives could explain some of the technicalities of the proposal.

4. Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission, Status of Planning:

The Chairman reported that he had attended a meeting of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission, at the request of Honorable Francis Biddle, Chairman of that Commission. The Roosevelt Commission has been given, by P.L. 372/84th Congress, a choice of 27 acres of the total area of 60 acres along the Potomac River south of Independence Avenue. The commission is now planning to sponsor a competition for design of a suitable memorial to be erected on this site. Mr. Edmund Bacon has been selected to manage the details of the competition with the assistance of the American Institute of Architects.

5. National Geographic Society, Admiral Byrd Memorial, Status of Plans for:

Mr. deWeldon, the sculptor member of the Commission, reported that the National Capital Planning Commission had approved the designs for the memorial to Admiral Byrd which was to be located on Memorial Avenue leading to Arlington National Cemetery. The designs for the memorial were now being submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for his approval. The designs now incorporated all suggestions made previously by the Commission.

6. American Battle Monuments Commission, Sculpture by Bruce Moore for the American Military Cemetery, Honolulu, Hawaii:

The members of the Commission viewed photographs of the plaster model of the eagle by Bruce Moore, intended for use in the architecture of the American Military Cemetery, Honolulu, Hawaii. The eagles will serve as a kind of over-door decoration on four openings in the memorial building. The design was considered to be handsome and was approved as presented. The secretary was instructed to draft a letter for the Chairman's Signature, to the ABMC, stating the Commission's views. (EXHIBIT H)

III LEGISLATION

1. H.J. Res. 543/86th Congress - Mr. Thompson of New Jersey - "To establish a commission to formulate plans for a living memorial to President Woodrow Wilson, President James Madison, and other past Presidents of the United States, and to provide ways and means of perpetuating our esteem for other distinguished citizens and avoid undue cluttering of the Nation's Capital with statues of the near great and forgotten."

In reviewing the text of H.J. Res. 543 the problem was raised as to whether one memorial to all Presidents would be preferable to individual memorials to the most outstanding Presidents. There was also some vagueness in the members' minds as to the exact meaning of the term, "living memorial." The members of the Commission felt that individual memorials were probably more desirable in general. It was agreed, however, to make a favorable report on H.J. Res. 543, and to suggest the possibility of including such a memorial in the new cultural center. The Secretary was directed to draft such a report for the Chairman's signature. (EXHIBIT I)

2. S.J. Res. 147 - 86th Congress - Senator Fulbright of Arkansas -
H.R. 544 - 86th Congress - Mr. Thompson of New Jersey
"Providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

Drafts for a report on this legislation had been mailed to the members previously. The Chairman summed up the provisions of the bills and noted that they would require Federal and District Officials to make a statement in writing to the President and to the Committees on Public Works and on the District of Columbia in the Senate and in the House of Representatives when contracting officials do not follow the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts. The members of the Commission approved the draft report on these bills and expressed the hope that they might be passed by the Congress at the earliest possible date. (EXHIBIT J)

3. Draft Legislation - National Capital Planning Commission - Proposed Joint Resolution "reserving as public open space the area in the District of Columbia between E Street and Constitution Avenue and 23d Street and 25th Streets, N.W."

The Secretary explained that the National Capital Planning Commission had sponsored this legislation and was hoping for action by the Congress. It was a precautionary measure designed to protect the Old Naval Observatory and Hospital Site from encroachment of any roadways, large buildings or memorials. The members agreed that this would be desirable legislation, but deferred further action until requested by the Congress for advice. (EXHIBIT K)

4. Draft Legislation - Bureau of the Budget - Proposed Bill "To develop a unified and integrated system of transportation for the National Capital region; to create a temporary National Capital Transportation Corporation; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate transportation agency; and for other purposes."

The Chairman reviewed the status of this draft legislation which is awaiting action in Congress. The members of the Commission reaffirmed their report in which adoption of a rapid transit system was urged, rather than indiscriminate construction of more freeways.

(EXHIBIT L)

Respectfully submitted,


L. R. Wilson
Secretary

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

19 JANUARY 1960

3:00 P.M.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
2. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 17 February 1960
Executive Session: 16 February 1960
3. a. Minutes of 17/18 November 1959, action on
b. Minutes of 15/16 December 1959, distribution of
4. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT:
 - a. Report of Actions Taken on Shipstead-Luce Act Applications Since 12/15/59 (Report dated 1/19/60-Appendix 1) *app.*
 - b. Review of progress in determination of the boundaries of the Shipstead-Luce Act
 - c. Report of D.C. Board of Appeals and Review on Albert Dence Studio Case (S.L. 2173)
 - d. Informal revision to Enterprise Fed. Savings & Loan Assn.
5. OLD GEORGETOWN ACT:
 - a. Report of Actions Taken on Old Georgetown Act Applications Since 12/15/59 (Report dated 1/19/60-Appendix 2)
 - b. Consideration of O.G. 2518, 1401 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. (Avignone Freres)
 - c. Attorney General's Review of D.C. Corporation Counsel's Opinion (Status)
 - d. Report of Chairman's attendance at informal meeting with others, under auspices of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, reference amending the Old Georgetown Act, on Jan. 13, 1960.
6. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION:
 - a. Commission of Fine Arts Budget Estimates, FY 1961 - Chairman's Statement.
 - b. Rochebelle Bridge (14th Street)- Letter from Mr. Henry R. Shapley, to D.C. Board of Commissioners dated 12/23/59 recommending grey instead of green for future painting of ironwork.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250

MEMORANDUM

TO: DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

FROM: ASST. DIR. FOR LAND ACQUISITION

SUBJECT: [Illegible]

1. [Illegible]

2. [Illegible]

3. [Illegible]

4. [Illegible]

5. [Illegible]

6. [Illegible]

7. [Illegible]

8. [Illegible]

9. [Illegible]

10. [Illegible]

11. [Illegible]

12. [Illegible]

13. [Illegible]

14. [Illegible]

- c. Franklin D. Roosevelt Commission - Report of Chairman's Conference
- d. Commission of Fine Arts - 50th Anniversary /report (Mr. Cassmeyer's Draft)
- e. Admiral Byrd Memorial - Status of Plans
- f. Street Lighting in the District of Columbia - Program For improving
- g. Death of William Delano - Former member of the CFA
- h. Commission of Fine Arts regulation proposing amendment of the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

7. LEGISLATION:

- a. H.J.Res. 543 - Mr. Thompson - Living Memorials to Past Presidents Report Requested
- b. S.J.Res. 197 - Mr. Johnson - To establish a Commission to formulate plans for memorials to the past Presidents of the United States. Report requested
- c. H.J.Res. 544 - Mr. Thompson - Providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comments on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. Report Requested.
- d. S.J. Res. 147 - Mr. Fulbright - "C" " " " "
- e. Draft Legislation - HCPG - Reserving as public open space the area in the District of Columbia between E Street and Constitution Avenue and 23d and 25th Streets, N.W.
- f. Draft Legislation - Harriet Bureau - to develop a unified and integrated system of transportation for the National Capital region; to create a temporary National Capital Transportation Corporation; to authorize negotiation to create an Interstate Transportation Agency; and for other purposes - Status

8. SUBMISSIONS:

- a. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE:
 - (1) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Building
17th Street between New York Avenue and F St., N.W.
 - (2) St. Elizabeths Hospital - Treatment and Cafeteria Bldg
 - (3) St. Elizabeths Hospital - Two additions to administration bldg.

1. *Explain the importance of the following factors in the development of a country's economy:*

and the compliance categories and measures used will be published in the Federal Register.

© 2000 Blackwell Science Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 247: 391–397

[illegible]

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 08-19-2006 BY 60322 UCBAW/SJS

80th CONGRESS
2d Session

S. 2778

(4) Labor Department Building at 6th and C Sts., N.W.—Penthouse

(5) Federal Triangle Refrigeration Plant

b. DISTRICT ENGINEER, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY

Salaculla Reservoir, 5700 MacArthur Boulevard, N.W. —
Addition to Filtration Plant and Chemical Building

c. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC:

Mr. Hennings from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, reported:

(1) Chesapeake Reservoir Bridge, Four Structures on D.C. Approach to

(2) Inner Loop - West Leg - Further discussion of Geometric
Studies made for

d. AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Honolulu - Hawaii - Sculpture of eagle by Bruce Moore

To amend the Act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts

1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-

2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

3 That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act Establishing a

4 Commission of Fine Arts" as amended (40 U.S.C. 105), be

5 amended to read as follows:

6 "Sec. 2. That so much the expenses made necessary by

7 this Act an expenditure of not exceeding \$100,000 a year be

8 hereby authorized."

© 2000 Blackwell Science Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 247: 395–402

S. 2778

[Report No. 1019]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 11, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following bill; which was read twice and placed on the calendar

A BILL

To amend the Act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act Establishing a
4 Commission of Fine Arts," as amended (40 U.S.C. 106), is
5 amended to read as follows:

6 "SEC. 2. That to meet the expenses made necessary by
7 this Act an expenditure of not exceeding \$100,000 a year is
8 hereby authorized."

I

EXHIBIT A

Calendar No. 1057

86TH CONGRESS
2D Session

S. 2778

[Report No. 1019]

A BILL

To amend the Act relating to the Commission
of Fine Arts.

By Mr. HENNING

JANUARY 11, 1960

Read twice and placed on the calendar

NOTED

JAN 15 1960

THE CLERK

AMENDING THE ACT ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION
OF FINE ARTS

JANUARY 11, 1960.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2778]

The Committee on Rules and Administration, having considered an original bill (S. 2778) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

At the time the Commission of Fine Arts was created, on May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371), it was provided that an expenditure of not exceeding \$10,000 a year be authorized to meet the expenses of the Commission. Public Law 45 of the 84th Congress (69 Stat. 66) increased this authorization to \$35,000 a year.

By letter of June 5, 1959, addressed to the President of the Senate by the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, the committee requested that its enabling act be further amended to authorize, in lieu of \$35,000 per year, "such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Although the Committee on Rules and Administration agrees that legislative action should be taken to eliminate the disparity between the 1955 authorization and the current operating budget of the Commission of Fine Arts, the committee prefers to set a specific authorization of \$100,000 rather than to provide a general authorization for appropriations wholly without fiscal limitation. Accordingly, the committee recommends that S. 2778, which would increase the annual authorization of the Commission of Fine Arts from \$35,000 to \$100,000, do pass. In the committee's judgment this larger figure should be amply sufficient for the financing of the Commission in the foreseeable future.

The letter to the President of the Senate from the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, previously referred to, and a further exchange

of correspondence between the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Commission on Fine Arts, are as follows:

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, June 5, 1959.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President, the United States Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I enclose for consideration a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts.

The proposed legislation would eliminate a fixed limit of authorization of \$35,000 for the expenditures of the Commission of Fine Arts, as established on May 25, 1955 (40 U.S.C., sec. 106). The Commission, which has been careful in its expenditure of Government funds over the 49 years of its existence, would prefer to have its enabling act amended to authorize "such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Experience during the past 3 years, since 1955, has verified the Commission's fears that the limit of authorization was fixed too low, inasmuch as the actual operating expenses have already increased to a degree which makes it impossible to administer them within the \$35,000 limit. Salaries of the staff and travel expenses of the members have increased; and the workload has required the members to hold extra meetings and longer sessions to cover the projects which come before them. The members receive no pay for their services, only actual expenses in attending meetings, but heavier travel expenses, authorized pay increases, ingrade salary raises, costs of recording the meetings, and costs of reproduction services required for study and recording of the submissions have necessitated the Commission's seeking sums in excess of the \$35,000 limit for fiscal year 1960.

During the current fiscal year, it has been necessary to hold three extra meetings of the architect members of the Commission, the landscape architect member, and the executive secretary, in Philadelphia and New Haven in order to arrive at acceptable designs for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge and the exterior of the addition to the Department of State, in consultation with the architects and engineers of these projects. The cost of these three meetings, plus the absorption of ingrade salary raises, has made it impossible for the Commission to hold the regular monthly meetings scheduled for May and June 1959.

The funds appropriated for the Commission in fiscal years 1957 and 1958 were entirely exhausted. No unnecessary expenditures have been made for the administration of the secretary's office and the number of personnel has not risen in spite of the enlargement of the workload. It has not been possible to provide technical assistance for the secretary in processing the work. The Commission, therefore, has no other recourse, if it is to fulfill its responsibilities, but to request the Congress for a new amendment to its enabling act that will establish an authorization within which it will be able to do its work without canceling scheduled meetings and conferences, or asking the members to pay their own expenses in attending meetings.

Favorable action by the Congress on the Commission's request is strongly recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation, and that it concurs in the proposal.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. FINLEY, *Chairman.*

A BILL To amend the Act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act Establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," as amended (40 U.S.C., sec. 106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,
October 5, 1959.

Hon. DAVID E. FINLEY,
*Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FINLEY: This is in reference to your letter of June 5, 1959, addressed to Hon. Richard M. Nixon, President of the U.S. Senate, requesting the processing of an amendment to the enabling act of the Commission to authorize "such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Your above letter has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for appropriate attention. In this connection, your cooperation is solicited in providing additional information.

You will recall that Public Law 45 of the 84th Congress, approved May 25, 1955, increased the expenditure authorization of the Commission of Fine Arts from its original amount of \$10,000 to not exceeding \$35,000 a year. At the time the latter figure was approved the Committee on Rules and Administration was advised by letter of March 29, 1955, from the secretary of the Commission that the larger amount was agreeable.

Would you kindly advise the committee what the Commission's experience has been in operating under the \$35,000 limitation. Specifically, what appropriations have been made for the Commission's operations, on a year-by-year basis, and what amount of the appropriation has remained unexpended, if any?

I believe you are aware that, from time to time, certain segments of the Congress have strongly opposed so-called open-end authorizations such as the type you suggested in your draft amendment. With that in mind, would you be kind enough to recommend, for possible inclusion in a new amendment, a specific financial limitation within which you feel the Commission of Fine Arts could realistically perform its numerous responsibilities. Such additional information or comments as you may care to offer would be highly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

GORDON F. HARRISON
(By direction).

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, October 13, 1959.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in reply to Mr. Gordon Harrison's letter of October 5, in which he requested information supplementing our letter to the President of the U.S. Senate of June 5, 1959, and supporting the Commission's request for consideration of draft legislation to amend the enabling act of the Commission as regards fiscal limit of authorization.

Mr. Harrison's letter specifically asked for figures showing appropriations for the last 5 years. A table showing such figures and the expenditures for four of the years follows:

Fiscal year	Appropriation	Expenditures	Unexpended balance
1956.....	\$22,200	\$22,174	\$26.32
1957.....	31,000	30,895	104.83
1958.....	35,625	35,620	4.58
1959.....	37,700	37,633	67.35
1960.....	42,300		

The above figures indicate that the appropriations for the Commission have exceeded the \$35,000 limitation for the last 3 years. The excess for 1958 and 1959 and a portion of that for 1960 was required by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-462). An additional \$4,600 was requested and appropriated for the fiscal year 1960 to cover additional travel costs by reason of the appointment of a member from New Mexico to the Commission. Because of the heavy workload, it is anticipated that an increase will be requested for the fiscal year 1961.

As it is not possible to anticipate what the workload will be several years from now, or to foresee what legislation there may be which will affect the workload or the costs, the Commission hesitates to recommend a specific limitation amount.

The Commission of Fine Arts will complete 50 years of service to the Federal Government in 1960. During the 49 years in which the Commission has been in operation, the Congress has appropriated \$617,965 for the Commission's use. During this time the Government has had the benefit of services, free of charge, of more than 60 architects, 4 landscape architects, 8 painters, and 11 sculptors and distinguished citizens interested in the fine arts, as shown by the attached list. The Commission has been meticulous in spending no more than is necessary for its staff, equipment and for the travel expenses of the members of the Commission. I think it would be fair to say that from no other agency has the Government received so much in the way of expert services for so small an outlay of funds. In fact, the amount appropriated for the Commission of Fine Arts is much less than the amounts appropriated to other agencies of the Government performing advisory services in other fields. In the case of a number of these agencies there is no limit of authorization

and I hope the same privilege may be accorded to the Commission of Fine Arts.

If further information is desired, I hope you will advise us.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. FINLEY, *Chairman.*

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

(Established by act of Congress approved May 17, 1910)

Daniel H. Burnham, architect, Chairman; appointed June 15, 1910; died June 1, 1912.

Frederick Law Olmsted, landscape architect; appointed June 15, 1910; reappointed June 15, 1914. Term of service expired September 11, 1918.

Thomas Hastings, architect; appointed June 15, 1910; reappointed June 15, 1914. Term of service expired September 21, 1917.

Daniel Chester French, sculptor; appointed June 15, 1910; appointed Chairman July 5, 1912; resigned June 15, 1915.

Francis D. Millet, painter; appointed June 15, 1910; died April 15, 1912.

Cass Gilbert, architect; appointed June 15, 1910; reappointed June 15, 1914; resigned September 20, 1916.

Charles Moore; appointed June 15, 1910; reappointed June 15, 1914; elected Chairman July 29, 1915; reappointed for third term September 11, 1918; reelected Chairman October 4, 1918; reappointed for fourth term November 3, 1922; reelected Chairman December 18, 1922; reappointed for fifth term December 9, 1926; reelected Chairman January 6, 1927; reappointed for sixth term December 8, 1930; reelected Chairman January 6, 1931; reappointed for seventh term December 18, 1934; reelected Chairman; resigned as Chairman September 29, 1937. The term of service of Mr. Moore expired January 18, 1940. Mr. Moore died September 25, 1942.

Edwin H. Blashfield, painter; appointed May 31, 1912, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Francis D. Millet. Term of service expired September 1, 1916.

Peirce Anderson, architect; appointed July 5, 1912, to fill vacancy caused by the death of Daniel H. Burnham. Term of service expired September 1, 1916.

Herbert Adams, sculptor; appointed June 15, 1915, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Daniel Chester French.

J. Alden Weir, painter; appointed September 1, 1916, to fill vacancy caused by termination of term of service of Mr. Blashfield. Mr. Weir died December 8, 1919.

Charles A. Platt, architect; appointed September 1, 1916, to fill vacancy caused by termination of term of service of Mr. Anderson.

William Mitchell Kendall, architect; appointed September 20, 1916, to fill vacancy caused by resignation of Mr. Gilbert.

John Russell Pope, architect; appointed September 21, 1917, to fill vacancy caused by termination of term of service of Mr. Hastings.

James L. Greenleaf, landscape architect; appointed September 11, 1918, to fill vacancy caused by termination of term of service of Frederick Law Olmsted; reappointed February 1, 1923.

William Sergeant Kendall, painter; appointed April 10, 1920, to fill vacancy caused by the death of J. Alden Weir.

James E. Fraser, sculptor; appointed May 7, 1920; to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of Mr. Adams.

Louis Ayres, architect; appointed February 19, 1921, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of William Mitchell Kendall.

Henry Bacon, architect; appointed February 21, 1921, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of Charles A. Platt. Mr. Bacon died February 16, 1924.

H. Siddons Mowbray, painter; appointed February 24, 1921, to fill vacancy caused by resignation of William Sergeant Kendall. Mr. Mowbray died January 13, 1928.

Milton B. Medary, Jr., architect; appointed December 2, 1922, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of John Russell Pope.

William Adams Delano, architect; appointed April 8, 1924, to fill vacancy caused by the death of Henry Bacon.

Lorado Taft, sculptor; appointed February 14, 1925, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of James E. Fraser.

Abram Garfield, architect; appointed November 2, 1925, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of Louis Ayres.

Benjamin W. Morris, architect; appointed January 7, 1927, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of Milton B. Medary, Jr.

Ferruccio Vitale, landscape architect; appointed September 28, 1927, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of James L. Greenleaf.

Ezra Winter, painter, appointed June 6, 1928, to fill vacancy caused by the death of H. Siddons Mowbray.

John W. Cross, architect; appointed October 25, 1928, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of William Adams Delano.

Adolph A. Weinman, sculptor; appointed February 23, 1929, to fill vacancy caused by termination of service of Lorado Taft.

John L. Mauran, architect; appointed October 22, 1930, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Abram Garfield. Mr. Mauran died September 23, 1933.

Egerton Swartwout, architect; appointed August 10, 1931, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Benjamin W. Morris.

Gilmore D. Clarke, landscape architect; appointed April 21, 1932, to fill vacancy caused by the termination of service of Ferruccio Vitale; reappointed April 18, 1936; elected Vice Chairman May 1, 1936; elected Chairman September 29, 1937; reappointed and elected Chairman April 18, 1940; reappointed and elected Chairman March 16, 1945.

Lee Lawrie, sculptor; appointed January 18, 1933, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Adolph A. Weinman.

John Mead Howells, architect; appointed January 25, 1933, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of John W. Cross.

Eugene F. Savage, painter; appointed February 11, 1933, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Ezra Winter; reappointed January 26, 1937, and term of service expired March 28, 1941.

Charles A. Coolidge, architect, appointed December 14, 1933, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of John L. Mauran. Mr. Coolidge died April 1, 1936.

Charles L. Borie, Jr., architect; appointed February 17, 1936, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Egerton Swartwout.

Henry R. Shepley, architect; appointed April 28, 1936, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Coolidge; elected Vice Chairman August 10, 1938.

William F. Lamb, architect; appointed January 19, 1937, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Howells; reappointed March 24, 1941; elected Vice Chairman May 9, 1941.

Paul Manship, sculptor; appointed January 22, 1937, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Lawrie.

Edward Bruce, art critic; appointed January 19, 1940, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Moore. Mr. Bruce died January 26, 1943.

Paul P. Cret, architect; appointed April 25, 1940, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Borie. Reappointed March 17, 1945. Dr. Cret died September 8, 1945.

John A. Holabird, architect; appointed May 3, 1940, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Shepley. Reappointed March 19, 1945. Mr. Holabird died May 4, 1945.

Henry V. Poor, painter; appointed March 29, 1941, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Savage.

Ralph Stackpole, sculptor; appointed October 6, 1941, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Manship.

David E. Finley, art critic; appointed May 11, 1943, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Bruce; reappointed May 16, 1947.

William T. Aldrich, architect; appointed August 30, 1945, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Holabird.

L. Andrew Reinhard, architect; appointed August 31, 1945, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Lamb.

Maurice Sterne, painter; appointed September 4, 1945, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Poor.

Frederick V. Murphy, architect; appointed November 30, 1945, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. Cret.

Lee Lawrie, sculptor; appointed December 5, 1945, to fill the vacancy caused by the termination of service of Mr. Stackpole.

SECRETARIES AND EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

The officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, ex officio.

Col. Spencer Cosby, United States Army, 1910-13; served until detailed as military attaché at the American Embassy to France.

Col. William W. Harts, United States Army, 1913-17; served until relieved and assigned for military duty in France.

Maj. C. S. Ridley, United States Army, 1917-21.

Lt. Col. C. O. Sherrill, United States Army, 1921-22.

H. P. Caemmerer, 1922-.

CHANGES IN THE MEMBERSHIP THAT HAVE OCCURRED SINCE 1950

Architects:

Pietro Belluschi, 1950-55.
Edward F. Neild, Sr., 1950-55.
Joseph Hudnut, 1950-55.
Douglas W. Orr, 1955-.
William G. Perry, 1955-.
Wallace K. Harrison, 1955-59.
Ralph Walker, 1959-.

Sculptors:

Felix W. de Weldon, 1950-55, 1955-.

Landscape architects:

Elbert Peets, 1950-55, 1955-58.
Michael Rapuano, 1958-.

Painters:

George Biddle, 1950-51, 1953-55.
Emily L. Muir, 1955-59.
Peter Hurd, 1959-.

Secretaries and executive officers:

H. P. Caemmerer, 1922-54.
Linton R. Wilson, 1954-.

Lay members:

David E. Finley, 1943-55, 1955-, Chairman.



NOTED
JAN 15 1960

THE
MEMBER

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 544

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 11, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey introduced the following joint resolution;
which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

JOINT RESOLUTION

Providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Whereas the Congress established a permanent Commission of Fine Arts by the Act of May 10, 1910 (36 Stat. 371; 40 U.S.C. 104), to be composed of seven well-qualified judges of the fine arts to be appointed by the President and serve without pay for a period of four years each and until their successors are appointed and qualified, and whose duties are to advise generally upon questions of art when required to do so by the President or by any committee of either House of Congress; and

Whereas the duties of the said Commission have been further specified by Executive Order Numbered 1259, dated Octo-

ber 25, 1910, directing that "Plans for no public buildings to be erected in the District of Columbia for the General Government shall be hereafter fully approved by the officer duly authorized until after such officer shall have submitted the plans to the Commission of Fine Arts for comment and advice."; and

Whereas Executive Order Numbered 1862, dated November 28, 1913, further specified that "whenever new structures are to be erected in the District of Columbia under the direction of the Federal Government which affect in any important way the appearance of the city, or whenever questions involving matters of art and with which the Federal Government is concerned are to be determined, final action shall not be taken until such plans and questions have been submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts, for comment and advice"; and

Whereas Executive Order Numbered 3524, dated July 28, 1921, directed that "essential matters relating to the design of medals, insignia, and coins produced by the executive departments, also the designs of statues, fountains, and monuments, and all important plans for parks and all public buildings, constructed by executive departments or the District of Columbia, which in any essential way affect the appearance of the city of Washington, or the District of Columbia, shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for advice as to the merits of such designs before the executive officer having charge of the same shall approve thereof"; and

Whereas the extent of the city of Washington has grown beyond the limits of the District of Columbia as specified in the above Act and Executive orders; and

Whereas many important decisions affecting the appearance of the city of Washington are made by Federal and District of Columbia Government officials without consulting the Commission of Fine Arts as provided above; and

Whereas recommendations of the Commission are advisory only:

Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That all officials of the United States and of the District of
4 Columbia charged, by Act of Congress or otherwise, with
5 responsibility for seeking advice and comment from the
6 Commission of Fine Arts shall consult with such Commis-
7 sion in the early stages of matters with respect to which
8 such advice or comment is sought, before final decisions or
9 plans are made; and in any case in which any such official
10 does not carry out recommendations made by the Commis-
11 sion in giving advice or comment as requested, such official
12 shall report his reasons therefor, in writing, to the President
13 of the United States, the Committees on Public Works of
14 the Senate and House of Representatives, and the Commit-
15 tees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of
16 Representatives. The provisions of this joint resolution shall
17 be applicable to decisions of officials of the United States or
18 of the District of Columbia on matters within the jurisdiction
19 of the Commission, as prescribed by law and Executive

- 1 Order, with respect to parks and structures within the metro-
- 2 politan area of the District of Columbia in areas of Maryland
- 3 and Virginia which are adjacent to the District of Columbia.

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 544

JOINT RESOLUTION

Providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey

JANUARY 11, 1960

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

JAN 15 1960

NOTED

CONCLUSIONS

The Commission of Fine Arts recommends that, while the standards and requirements of the Federal Highway Act of 1938 may be properly applicable to Federally Financed Highways throughout the country, such standards, when applied within the metropolitan area of the city of Washington, are destructive of the White House, Arlington and other sites which have been responsible for the beauty of the city, especially as regards parks, public buildings and monuments. Such standards impose upon the city inconveniences of such size and complexity as to threaten the preservation of park areas and the utilization of the land as intended by plans that have long been established. These requirements are also destructive of the scale of monumental structures, such as the Lincoln Memorial and the proposed National Mall Center. These monumental buildings should not be subjected to competition from surrounding roadways and structures, which seriously affect their sites.

The Commission of Fine Arts, therefore, recommends that the Department of Commerce amend the regulations and, if necessary, such legislation to amend the Federal Highway Act of 1938, so that the design criteria used in accordance therewith will not be applied to the metropolitan area of the city of Washington.

1/19/60

NO. ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

ACTION

2240 1401 Penna. Ave., NW
Willard Coffee House

2 s-f signs to replace 3 exist. signs.
(1) 6-2/3 sq-ft sign on Pa. Ave. (2)
7-1/4 sq-ft sign on corner of 14th &
Pa. Ave. White light within box 11-
luminating cut-out ltrs.

App'd. for: (1) Sign located above entr. on
Pa. Ave., as presented in drawing #5815, dtd.
12/17/59; & (2) Sign at corner of 14th St. &
Pa. Ave., provided it is placed within window
jacks, & provided lamp at top of sign, & the
word "COCKTAILS", are omitted. Request new
sketch for second sign. 1/13/60

2241 1331 E St., NW
Ballantynes
Book Store

1 s-f, 24-sq-ft sign. Stainless steel ltrs.,
back-lighted with white neon tubing. 13"
from wall face to ltr. face.

App'd., provided sign can be fitted neatly
into head of window, so as to reduce projec-
tion of sign box from bldg. 1/13/60

2242 125 Indep. Ave., SE
French Poodle Dress
Shop

Remodel bldg. front; add showwindow,
lower entr. & construct marquise
above; 6'-6" wide marquise & 12'-4"
wide showwindow to ext. 42" beyond
bldg. line.

Disap'd: (1) Recom. design be restudied, omitting
projecting showwindow, with thought given to re-
taining in design, Victorian character of exist.
bldg; or (2) Recom. facade of bldg. be razed & new
facade erected after a design that recognizes ad-
jacency to Library of Congress & Capitol Grounds, 1/19/60

2243 7201-16th St., NW
Dr. Allen E.
Henkin

Construct frame addn.
to rear of dwelling.

Disap'd; recom. new work be designed in such a way
as to complement main house, & be made in brick to
match exist. walls, 1/19/60

APPENDIX 1

~~EXHIBIT B~~

Exhibit B

EXHIBIT 10

Section
The Alfred E.
Nelson House, 1900
to west of Jefferson
County, Iowa, 1900.

west of Jefferson, Iowa, 1900
to complement main house, & be made in brick to
Dishard; recommend work be designed in such a way

Section
The Alfred E.
Nelson House, 1900
to west of Jefferson
County, Iowa, 1900.

Section to Library of Congress & Capitol Records, 1900
facade erected after a design that recognizes ad-
plac; or (2) second facade of design be raised & new
building in design; Victorian character of extant
projecting show window, with thought given to re-
Dischard; (1) second design be restricted, omitting

Section
The Alfred E.
Nelson House, 1900
to west of Jefferson
County, Iowa, 1900.

Section to Library of Congress & Capitol Records, 1900
facade erected after a design that recognizes ad-
plac; or (2) second facade of design be raised & new
building in design; Victorian character of extant
projecting show window, with thought given to re-
Dischard; (1) second design be restricted, omitting

Section
The Alfred E.
Nelson House, 1900
to west of Jefferson
County, Iowa, 1900.

Section to Library of Congress & Capitol Records, 1900
facade erected after a design that recognizes ad-
plac; or (2) second facade of design be raised & new
building in design; Victorian character of extant
projecting show window, with thought given to re-
Dischard; (1) second design be restricted, omitting

Section
The Alfred E.
Nelson House, 1900
to west of Jefferson
County, Iowa, 1900.

Section

22 January 1960

Dear Mr. Green:

At its meeting on January 19, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts considered the architect's sketch elevation of the revised design for the building for the Enterprise Federal Savings and Loan Association, which will be located at 213 Market Space, N. W.

It was noted that suggestions regarding materials and treatment of the facade, made by the Commission at the December meeting on a previous submission, had been incorporated into the new sketch. The members, however, are still of the opinion that they cannot approve this design. They liked the use of limestone but were of the opinion that the same system of jointing to be applied to the low portion should be applied to the whole building, and would prefer to see the free standing green marble piers made of this same material. It will also be necessary to see what the treatment of the tall side wall will be. A simple perspective sketch would show the treatment of all these features.

As for the decorative features suggested in the sketch, the Commission has no objection to the eagle, but the members think it should be smaller and placed higher up on the wall, near the place where the lower wall overlaps the higher portion of the building.

The sign, as indicated, is too large, too restless and lacks dignity. Submission of a new design using classic type letters, spaced more compactly, is recommended.

The Commission will meet again on February 16.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Chief, Permit Branch
Department of Licenses and Inspections
106 District Building
Washington 4, D.C.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 12/15/59

1/19/60

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
2508	1305 Wisc. Ave., NW Tasty Bake Shop	1-story addn. to bldg.	Recom'd. for parts visible from a public highway. It is assumed that a showwindow, similar in design to the one on the front facade, will be installed perpendicular to the bldg. line & adjacent to the door. It is suggested that the transom over the door be divided into three lights instead of two lights as shown, 12/23/59
2509	3401 Dent Pl. Georgetown Constr. Company	Convert store & flat into two 1-family flats.	Recom'd. for parts visible from public highway. It is suggested that mullion in 2nd-fl. double window be eliminated to make this window similar in character to 2nd-fl. window in corner, & wide window in 3403 Dent Pl., 12/23/59
2510	3403 Dent Pl. Georgetown Constr. Co.	Convert store & flat into two 1-family flats	Recom'd. for parts visible from <u>public highway, 12/23/59</u>
2511	1553-33rd St. Raymond Regan	Remodel interior; change front & rear windows; new brick area in rear; new brick entr. steps.	Recom'd. for parts visible from <u>public highway, 12/24/59</u>
2512	1806 Wisc. Ave. Mrs. Dorothy Ballas	Replace front double-hung window with picture window; move front entr. door to north side of bldg.	Not recom'd. No objection to moving door, but suggest present spacing of windows be kept. Further suggest that door opening be kept same height as window opening (NOTE: The drawings for exterior changes are inadequate to indi- cate details of proposed changes. Suggest resubmission), 12/23/59
2513	1212-30th St. Mrs. M. B. Tyson	Replace exist. cast iron steps by brick stairway with stone treads, on front of house.	Not recom'd. Suggest retention of present cast iron steps, which are in better character with house than proposed steps, 12/23/59

APPENDIX 2

~~EXHIBIT E~~

Exhibit 7

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 12/15/59 (Continued) 1/19/60

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
2514	2735 P St., NW Mr & Mrs. H. N. Jacobson	Remove exist. windows facing P St. in bay & replace with new French windows. Entire masonry on facade to be painted tan & trim painted grey; remove exist. wall; install new door.	Recom'd. for parts visible from <u>public highway, 12/23/59</u>
2515	1339-29th St. Edward Burling, Jr.	Erect playhouse, brick & wood; install swimming pool.	Recom'd. for parts visible from <u>public highway, 12/22/59</u>
2516	1522 Wisc. Ave., NW A. L. Wheeler (Beall's Express)	Correct all deficiencies in order of Board of Cond. of Insan. Bldgs. 1st fl. (Store); 2nd fl. (Office); 3rd fl. (2 apts.)	See attached ltr. dtd. 1/5/60, to President of the D. C. Board of <u>Commissioners, 1/5/60</u>
2517	1225 Wisc. Ave. Tivoli Restaurant, Inc.	Awning, red & white canvas; suspended from bldg. with fixed iron frames; ext. 3' beyond bldg. line & 2'-10" beyond point of attachment.	Recom'd. for parts visible from <u>public highway, 1/5/60</u>
2518	1401 Wisc. Ave. Avignone Freres	3-story brick & limestone bldg. for restaurant & offices	<u>Action not complete, 1/19/60</u>
2519	2713 P St. Mildred Cozzone	Replace front & rear iron porches. Entr. steps (4'-9" wide) to ext. 7'-9" beyond bldg. line.	Recom'd. for parts visible from <u>public highway, 1/11/60</u>
2520	1806 Wisc. Ave. Dorethy Ballas	Move entr. to right side of bldg. & replace with large window.	Ret'd. No obj. to general scheme indicated for change in location of door & installation of large window on 1st fl; but drawings are inadequate for specific size & character of door, doorframe, window muntins, w. i. railing, brick steps, & other details, 1/12/60

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 12/15/59 (Continued)

1/19/60

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
2521	3038 Dent Pl., NW Mary E. Cavanaugh	Replace rear 2-story open porch with 1-story uncovered wood porch.	Recom'd. for parts visible from <u>public highway, 1/11/60</u>
2522	1806 Wisc. Ave. Dorethy Ballas	Alter 1st fl. street facade (move door to right side of bldg. & replace with large window)	Recom'd., as revised, for parts visible from <u>a public highway, provided wood trim & cornice is omitted from window, 1/13/60</u>

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

January 5, 1960

Dear Mr. McLaughlin:

The Commission of Fine Arts has received an application for the rehabilitation of the premises at 1522 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W., (O. G. 2516), of which Mr. A. L. Wheeler is the owner. The plans for the rehabilitation of the building have been made by Mr. W. C. Barrington, architect.

The Commission would be glad to approve these plans for a new building to be erected in Georgetown, as being an effort to add to the architecture of the Georgetown area. In this case, however, the building is an old one, which was erected about 1790, and is the type of building which the Georgetown Act provides should be preserved and protected. It is an example of the type of architecture used in the national capital in its initial years. The members of the Commission would prefer, therefore, in this case, that the Wisconsin Avenue facade should be preserved rather than rebuilt; and that the roof with dormer windows be retained and not eliminated as in the plans that have been submitted; also that the present size and scale of the windows be retained, and that the shop front on the street level be less elaborate in keeping with the simple design of the old building.

The Commission appreciates the efforts of the owner to save this building from demolition, but hopes that his plans can be adapted so as to preserve the street facade as nearly as possible in its original state.

As the Board of Condemnation has ordered the building to be demolished by January 15, and the next meeting of the Commission will be held on January 19, the members of the Commission have been sent the blueprints by mail, and have expressed their views as stated above. The architect members of the Commission, Mr. Douglas W. Orr, Mr. Ralph Walker and Mr. William Perry, particularly hope that this fine example of Early American architecture may be preserved so far as conditions permit.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Honorable Robert McLaughlin
President, Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia
Washington 4, D. C.

Sincerely yours,
Signed
David E. Finley
Chairman

Exhibit 7-1



Department of Justice

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
JANUARY 18, 1960

The Department of Justice made public today the following opinion given to the President by Attorney General William P. Rogers:

January 15, 1960

The President

The White House

My dear Mr. President:

I have the honor to respond to your request for my opinion concerning the construction of the Act of September 22, 1950, 64 Stat. 903, creating the "Old Georgetown" district in the District of Columbia and regulating the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings therein. It appears that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the National Commission of Fine Arts are in disagreement as to the scope of the Act.

Section 2 of the Act provides that "[in] order to promote the general welfare and to preserve and protect the places and areas of historic interest, exterior architectural features and examples of the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its early years", the District Commissioners, before issuing any permit "for the construction, alteration, reconstruction, or razing of any building" in the Old Georgetown district, shall refer the plans to the Commission of Fine Arts

(established by the Act of May 17, 1910, 36 Stat. 371, 40 U.S.C. § 104) for its report "as to the exterior architectural features, height, appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction which is subject to public view from a public highway." The Commission of Fine Arts is required to report to the District Commissioners its recommendations, including such changes as it deems necessary to preserve the historic value of the district. The Commissioners are authorized to take such actions as they regard proper in the circumstances.^{1/} The Act expressly provides, § 5, that it shall not be construed as superseding or affecting legislation relating to the alteration, repair, or demolition of insanitary or unsafe buildings.

1/ The text of § 2 reads as follows:

SEC. 2. In order to promote the general welfare and to preserve and protect the places and areas of historic interest, exterior architectural features and examples of the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its initial years, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, before issuing any permit for the construction, alteration, reconstruction, or razing of any building within said Georgetown district described in section 1 shall refer the plans to the National Commission of Fine Arts for a report as to the exterior architectural features, height, appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction which is subject to public view from a public highway. The National Commission of Fine Arts shall report promptly to said Commissioners of the District of Columbia its recommendations, including such changes, if any, as in the judgment of the Commission are necessary and desirable to preserve the historic value of said Georgetown district. The said Commissioners shall take such actions as in their judgment are right and proper in the circumstances: Provided, That, if the said Commission of Fine Arts fails to submit a report on such plans within forty-five days, its approval thereof shall be assumed and a permit may be issued.

There are two principal areas of disagreement between the Commission of Fine Arts and the District Commissioners. The Commission of Fine Arts asserts, first, that the Act applies to all buildings in the Old Georgetown district, whether old or new. The District Commissioners agree that the Act protects existing structures of demonstrable historic or architectural interest. They claim, however, that it does not reach new construction or the alteration of existing structures generally, but only to the extent that such construction or alteration might be said adversely to affect nearby protected structures. The second matter in dispute is whether the operation of the Act is confined to buildings proper or extends to such appurtenances as advertising signs, fences, and walls. The Fine Arts Commission claims the latter, the District Commissioners, the former.

The background for the legislation is as follows: Georgetown was founded as an organized community in 1751. By the time of the Revolution it had become a town of some commercial importance and had many fine homes. Its continuing development influenced the selection of the site of the National Capital in 1791. Georgetown scholars have said (Eberlein and Hubbard, Historic Houses of George-Town & Washington City (1958) 12):

By the time the momentous decisions upon the site of Washington took place, George-Town was a full-fledged self-possessed community with all the machinery of civilised society working smoothly--a place quite fit to be the foster parent of an urban development on the other side of Rock Creek.

Georgetown's "golden age" covered the years 1775-1825. Concerning its architecture during that period, it has been stated that the houses "are true examples of the Federal tradition, influenced by Colonial antecedents, but built during the early days of the new Republic--examples of a school which flourished under the patronage of Thomas Jefferson who,

as Secretary of State under Washington and as President, had very considerable influence in fostering America's Federal style. * * *. The homes of the period possess a delicacy of scale which distinguishes them, and which was the result of a masterful adaptation of elements of Classic precedent * * *." Davis, Dorsey and Hall, *Georgetown Houses of the Federal Period* (1944), 17.

Georgetown fell into decline during the latter part of the last century--" the warehouses crumbled along its once busy waterfront * * * its face became considerably altered by new rows of ugly Victorian dwellings, many of which remain. * * *. Georgetown's golden age became a memory, and the principal glory of the community became the lovely relics of its past." Davis, Dorsey and Hall, *op. cit.*, 16. Recent years have witnessed a rebirth for Georgetown which had never completely lost its individual atmosphere. There has been a concerted effort both official and private to re-establish the former exterior architectural appeal of Georgetown. Included in this effort is the legislation here involved, which was prompted, as noted by the House committee (H.R. Rept. No. 2468, 81st Cong., 2d Sess.), by the desire of Georgetown residents to protect the district "by an authority which will direct the type of structure suitable to the area", its original character predominating architecturally in the residences and streets.

It should also be noted that the Old Georgetown Act is not unique legislation. Similar authority has been provided for historic districts in such diverse places as Alexandria, Virginia, New Orleans, Louisiana, Charleston, South Carolina, Annapolis, Maryland, Nantucket, Boston, Salem and Lexington, Massachusetts, Natchez, Mississippi, Albuquerque, New Mexico,

1

[illegible]

and the Virgin Islands. See Morrison, Historic Preservation Law (1957); Planning and Community Appearance (1958), ch. IV, V (Report of the Joint Committee on Design Control of the New York Chapter, American Institute of Architects and the New York Regional Chapter, American Institute of Planners). Mr. Morrison states (op. cit., 7-8) that the legislation in the field employs standard terminology, indicating that the later ones have drawn on the earlier for guidance. It is therefore apparent that as a general proposition the judicial precedents for one are apposite for others.

I

I find no substantial support for the construction of the Old Georgetown Act urged by the District Commissioners which would restrict it in its operation to the protection of existing buildings possessing a demonstrable historical or architectural significance. The position taken by the Commissioners is the result of an opinion rendered by the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel, dated March 6, 1957. In that opinion the Corporation Counsel argues that, the language of the Act being "vague and indefinite", it is permissible to examine the legislative history and, since appropriate guidance is not to be found in the history, the statute must be interpreted by reference to relevant rules of statutory construction. The first rule cited is that a statute in derogation of the common law must be construed strictly rather than liberally. According to the Corporation Counsel, the Old Georgetown Act is a statute of that nature because it infringes upon an owner's right to use his property as he sees fit. The second rule is that a statute is to be construed to avoid constitutional doubts. While the Corporation Counsel concedes that an

owner's use of his property is subject to an appropriate exercise of the police power, he argues that if this legislation is construed as an attempt to control the construction of buildings in the Old Georgetown district, without regard to whether the immediate surrounding area contains a building of historical or architectural value, an owner could claim with reason that he had been arbitrarily deprived of the free use of his property. As the Corporation Counsel puts it, "the proposed use of property by an owner can be limited or directed along different lines under the authority of the Old Georgetown Act only if such proposed use, unless limited or changed, can reasonably be expected materially to harm, injure, destroy, or affect detrimentally a place or area of historic interest, or an example of a type of architecture or an exterior architectural feature used in the National Capital in its initial years."

I see nothing vague or ambiguous in the language used by Congress to denote the scope of the Act in this regard. The Act plainly states that the plans which must be submitted to the Fine Arts Commission are those for the "construction, alteration, reconstruction, or razing of any building" in the Old Georgetown district. It is difficult to believe that Congress would have used this comprehensive language had it been its intention to confine the statute to existing structures of demonstrable historic or architectural value. Such a reading is also inconsistent with the use of the word "construction", which obviously is not germane with reference to a building already standing. One cannot "construct" an existing building. The very title of the act suggests the broadest coverage; it is entitled "An Act To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of



The first of these is the fact that the
 government has been unable to secure
 the necessary funds to carry out its
 policy of non-interference in the
 internal affairs of the country.
 This has led to a situation where the
 government has been forced to
 resort to measures which are
 contrary to the principles of
 democracy and the rights of the
 people. The second of these is the
 fact that the government has been
 unable to secure the necessary
 funds to carry out its policy of
 non-interference in the internal
 affairs of the country. This has
 led to a situation where the
 government has been forced to
 resort to measures which are
 contrary to the principles of
 democracy and the rights of the
 people. The third of these is the
 fact that the government has been
 unable to secure the necessary
 funds to carry out its policy of
 non-interference in the internal
 affairs of the country. This has
 led to a situation where the
 government has been forced to
 resort to measures which are
 contrary to the principles of
 democracy and the rights of the
 people.

private and semi-public buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital."

Resort to the legislative history does not lead to a different interpretation. The Corporation Counsel states that it sheds little light on the problem. There is, however, one affirmative item of substantial significance regarding the intention of Congress. The bill as introduced (H.R. 7670, 81st Congress) omitted the word "construction" in the phrase of the statute reading "construction, alteration, reconstruction, or razing of any building within said Georgetown district * * *." That word was added by committee amendment (see H. Rept. No. 2468, supra), and it was included in the statute without debate. See 96 Cong. Rec. 10086-10087. In the face of this deliberate enlargement of the scope of the bill it is difficult to believe that Congress meant it to be read in the restricted manner suggested by the Corporation Counsel.

Moreover, considerable guidance as to the appropriate construction is furnished by the courts. As noted above, the Old Georgetown Act has its counterparts in other areas. Several have been the subject of judicial interpretation. Their constitutional validity has not been doubted. Nor have the courts indicated that such legislation must be narrowly construed on the assumption that it is in derogation of the "common right" (see City of New Orleans v. Pergament, 198 La. 852, 5 So. 2d 129 (1941); City of New Orleans v. Levy, 223 La. 14, 64 So. 2d 798 (1953)) or "common law" (see Opinion of the Justices, 333 Mass. 773, 128 N.E. 2d 553 (1955); Opinion of the Justices, 333 Mass. 783, 128 N.E. 2d 563 (1955)). In my judgment, the Corporation Counsel is not justified in stating that these decisions

...and the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

are not inconsistent with his opinion.

The Pergament and Levy cases involved the Vieux Carre district of New Orleans, the old Spanish and French quarters of the city. In 1936 the Louisiana constitution was amended to authorize the city to establish a Vieux Carre Commission to preserve buildings in the Vieux Carre district possessing architectural and historical value. For that purpose the plans for any new building in the district or those for alteration of an existing building therein had to be submitted to the commission for a report as to the appearance, color, texture of materials and architectural design of the exterior. The city thereafter established the commission and in the ordinance therefor provided that it should be unlawful for the proprietor of any building in the Vieux Carre to maintain an advertising sign without first obtaining a permit from the commission. In the Pergament case the defendant who owned a gasoline filling station in the Vieux Carre was prosecuted for displaying an advertising sign thereon without having obtained the permission of the commission. He demurred on a number of grounds, including that the ordinance as to his place of business was arbitrary, unreasonable and oppressive, deprived him of his property without due process of law, denied him the equal protection of the laws, and that the constitutional amendment did not authorize an ordinance with reference to buildings such as his, which was a modern structure, having no architectural or historical worth. The Supreme Court of Louisiana, in overruling the demurrer, stated in part (198 La., at p. 858):

* * * there is nothing arbitrary or discriminating in forbidding the proprietor of a modern building, as well as the proprietor of one of the ancient landmarks, in the Vieux Carre to display an unusually large sign upon his premises. The purpose of the ordinance is not only to preserve the old buildings themselves but to preserve the antiquity of the whole French and Spanish quarter, the tout ensemble, so to speak, by defending this relic against iconoclasm or vandalism. Preventing or prohibiting eyesores in such a locality is within the police power and within the scope of this municipal ordinance. The preservation of the Vieux Carre as it was originally is a benefit to the inhabitants of New Orleans generally, not only for the sentimental value of this show place but for its commercial value as well, because it attracts tourists and conventions to the city, and is in fact a justification for the slogan, America's most interesting city.

In the Levy case, decided in 1953, the Supreme Court of Louisiana, reaffirming its earlier holding in Pergament, sustained the defendant's conviction for displaying a building sign in violation of the Vieux Carre ordinance, even though the building itself had no historical or architectural value. The court also held that while aesthetic considerations alone might not be a sufficient constitutional basis for restricting the use of real property, "this legislation is in the interest of and beneficial to the inhabitants of New Orleans generally, the preserving of the Vieux Carre section being not only for its sentimental value but also for its commercial value, and hence it constitutes a valid exercise of the police power." (223 La., at p. 28.)

In 1955 the Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts expressed the opinion, in response to a legislative inquiry in accordance with Massachusetts practice, that there existed no constitutional infirmities in proposed legislation (thereafter enacted) controlling the erection, reconstruction, alteration, or razing of any building in the old and historic districts of Nantucket and similar legislation with respect to the historic

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the various projects and the results achieved. The report concludes with a summary of the work done and the plans for the future.

The second part of the report deals with the financial situation of the organization. It gives a detailed account of the income and expenditure for the year and shows how the funds have been used. It also includes a statement of the assets and liabilities of the organization at the end of the year.

The third part of the report deals with the personnel of the organization. It gives a list of the staff and their duties and also a list of the volunteers who have helped in the work. It also includes a statement of the training and development of the staff and volunteers.

Beacon Hill district in Boston. Opinions of the Justices, supra. The Justices held that the legislation did not constitute a taking of property in a technical sense since title remained in the owner, and that the proposed restrictions on the use of private property constituted a valid exercise of the police power. It is significant that in this connection the opinion cites the Old Georgetown Act, apparently assuming both its application to new construction and its constitutionality (see 333 Mass., at p. 781). The Justices expressly held that there was no constitutional problem in the application of the proposed legislation to new construction, stating that "[i]t is not difficult to imagine how the erection of a few wholly incongruous structures might destroy one of the principal assets of the town [Nantucket]." (333 Mass., at p. 780). Similarly, it was stated as to the Beacon Hill legislation (333 Mass., at p. 787):

The announced purpose of the act is to preserve this historic section for the educational, cultural, and economic advantage of the public. If the General Court believes that this object would be attained by the restrictions which the act would place upon the introduction into the district of inappropriate forms of construction that would destroy its unique value and associations, a court can hardly take the view that such legislative determination is so arbitrary or unreasonable that it cannot be comprehended within the public welfare.

The Supreme Court of Wisconsin has gone even further, sustaining as a valid exercise of the police power an ordinance regulating the architectural features of new buildings, without reference to any historical factors and solely on the basis of their relation to the architecture of existing structures in the area. State ex rel. Saveland P.H. Corp. v. Wieland, 269 Wis. 262, 69 N.W. 2d 217 (1955). While the specific basis of the ordinance was the desire to protect property values in the

neighborhood, the court indicated that in the light of the decision in Berman v. Parker, 348 U.S. 26 (1954)^{2/} aesthetic considerations alone might suffice.

The Corporation Counsel points to a statement in the Opinion of the Justices in the Nantucket case as "support^{ing} very strongly the position that he has consistently taken with respect to depriving property owners in the area affected by the Old Georgetown Act from making certain uses of their property." After concluding that the proposed legislation would be constitutional, the Justices added as a cautionary observation that "it would seem that refusal to permit the removal of some old and decrepit structure impossible to repair within reasonable cost might in some instances be an unconstitutional application of the act * * *." (333 Mass., at p. 781.) As the statement shows, the Justices were addressing themselves, not to the question here involved of constitutional authority to act in this area, but with the different question of administration of a constitutional law in an unconstitutional manner. I do not regard this cautionary language directed to a hypothetical situation as furnishing any support for the restrictive interpretation of the Old Georgetown Act urged by the Corporation Counsel in order to avoid constitutional doubts. As noted above, the Justices had no difficulty with the constitutionality of the legislation as it affected new construction. Moreover, the Act gives the District Commissioners ample power to deal in a reasonable manner with applications

^{2/} In Berman the court, in sustaining the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, stated (p. 33) that "[t]he concept of the public welfare is broad and inclusive. * * *. The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, aesthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well-balanced as well as carefully patrolled."

for the demolition of decrepit buildings. They are vested with the ultimate authority to "take such actions as in their judgment are right and proper in the circumstances." This provision plainly empowers the Commissioners to permit a decrepit building to be torn down if it should appear that its repair would be unduly expensive.

My study of the Act and its history, and of the cases dealing with analogous statutes, leads me to conclude that it extends to the exterior construction or alteration of all buildings in the Old Georgetown district, and that as so construed, it raises no serious constitutional issue.

II

The remaining question is whether the statute, which in terms mentions only "buildings," should be read as including such appurtenances as signs, outside lights, fences, and walls. The Corporation Counsel asserts the negative. He argues that by dictionary definition the word "building" does not have such a meaning, and that to give it a broader scope in the instant statute is unwarranted for the following reasons: (1) Being a statute in derogation of the common law it must be strictly interpreted; (2) Congress did not intend the statute to affect the application to Georgetown of the earlier Sign Act applying to the District of Columbia generally (Act of March 3, 1931, 46 Stat. 1486, D.C. Code (1951) §§ 1-231-1-233).

I must again disagree with the position of the Corporation Counsel. The dictionary definition is not controlling. It has been frequently held that the word "building" as used in a statute, deed, or contract may be construed to include such appurtenant structures as signs, fences, and

The following is a summary of the information received from the various sources mentioned above. It is to be understood that this summary is not intended to be a complete and exhaustive statement of all the facts and circumstances surrounding the case, but rather a concise statement of the material facts and circumstances which are material to the case.

The first of the facts mentioned above is that the defendant, [Name], was born on [Date] at [Place]. He is a [Nationality] and is currently residing at [Address]. He is a [Occupation] and is currently employed by [Employer].

The second of the facts mentioned above is that the defendant, [Name], was arrested on [Date] at [Place]. He was arrested by [Arresting Officer] and was taken to the [Detention Facility]. He was held in custody for [Duration] and was then released on [Release Date].

The third of the facts mentioned above is that the defendant, [Name], was charged with [Charge] and was arraigned on [Date] at [Court]. He was represented by [Counsel] and was found guilty of the charge. He was sentenced to [Sentence] and is currently serving his sentence at [Prison].

walls, depending on the connection and purpose with which the word is employed. See, e.g., Swasey v. County of Shasta, 141 Cal. 392, 74 P. 1031 (1903); Kruetgen v. General Outdoor Advertising Co., 288 Ill. App. 619, 6 N.E. 2d 649 (1937); Wright v. Evans, 2 Abb. Pr. N.S. (N.Y.) 308 (1867); Mecca Realty Co. v. Kellogg Toasted Corn F. Co., 166 App. Div. 74, 151 N.Y.S. 750 (1915), and compare, 39 Op. A.G. 73, 77 (1937). It is unreasonable to believe that Congress meant to subject to the scrutiny of the Fine Arts Commission the exterior architectural features of buildings in the Old Georgetown district subject to public view from a public highway and at the same time to give the Commission no control over such appurtenances as signs, outside lights, fences, and walls which are equally exposed to public view; these if uncontrolled might readily disturb the general architectural appearance of the area. It is significant that the similar provisions in other jurisdictions either expressly refer to the display of signs or have been construed to authorize the promulgation of regulatory ordinances. Moreover, for the reasons adverted to in the first part of this opinion, I do not feel that the statute has to be narrowly construed under the claim that it is in derogation of law and in order to avoid constitutional doubts.

Nor am I impressed by the Corporation Counsel's reliance on the existing Sign Act. That statute obviously must yield to the subsequent Georgetown legislation to the extent that its continued application to the Georgetown district impedes the effectiveness of the later statute. It will be noted that § 5 of the Act explicitly provides that it shall not supersede or affect any earlier enactment relating to unsanitary or unsafe dwellings or other structures. This is a plain indication that but for the savings clause such earlier legislation would have been affected by



The first of these is the fact that the...
...the second is the fact that the...
...the third is the fact that the...
...the fourth is the fact that the...
...the fifth is the fact that the...
...the sixth is the fact that the...
...the seventh is the fact that the...
...the eighth is the fact that the...
...the ninth is the fact that the...
...the tenth is the fact that the...
...the eleventh is the fact that the...
...the twelfth is the fact that the...
...the thirteenth is the fact that the...
...the fourteenth is the fact that the...
...the fifteenth is the fact that the...
...the sixteenth is the fact that the...
...the seventeenth is the fact that the...
...the eighteenth is the fact that the...
...the nineteenth is the fact that the...
...the twentieth is the fact that the...
...the twenty-first is the fact that the...
...the twenty-second is the fact that the...
...the twenty-third is the fact that the...
...the twenty-fourth is the fact that the...
...the twenty-fifth is the fact that the...
...the twenty-sixth is the fact that the...
...the twenty-seventh is the fact that the...
...the twenty-eighth is the fact that the...
...the twenty-ninth is the fact that the...
...the thirtieth is the fact that the...
...the thirty-first is the fact that the...
...the thirty-second is the fact that the...
...the thirty-third is the fact that the...
...the thirty-fourth is the fact that the...
...the thirty-fifth is the fact that the...
...the thirty-sixth is the fact that the...
...the thirty-seventh is the fact that the...
...the thirty-eighth is the fact that the...
...the thirty-ninth is the fact that the...
...the fortieth is the fact that the...
...the forty-first is the fact that the...
...the forty-second is the fact that the...
...the forty-third is the fact that the...
...the forty-fourth is the fact that the...
...the forty-fifth is the fact that the...
...the forty-sixth is the fact that the...
...the forty-seventh is the fact that the...
...the forty-eighth is the fact that the...
...the forty-ninth is the fact that the...
...the fiftieth is the fact that the...
...the fifty-first is the fact that the...
...the fifty-second is the fact that the...
...the fifty-third is the fact that the...
...the fifty-fourth is the fact that the...
...the fifty-fifth is the fact that the...
...the fifty-sixth is the fact that the...
...the fifty-seventh is the fact that the...
...the fifty-eighth is the fact that the...
...the fifty-ninth is the fact that the...
...the sixtieth is the fact that the...
...the sixty-first is the fact that the...
...the sixty-second is the fact that the...
...the sixty-third is the fact that the...
...the sixty-fourth is the fact that the...
...the sixty-fifth is the fact that the...
...the sixty-sixth is the fact that the...
...the sixty-seventh is the fact that the...
...the sixty-eighth is the fact that the...
...the sixty-ninth is the fact that the...
...the seventieth is the fact that the...
...the seventy-first is the fact that the...
...the seventy-second is the fact that the...
...the seventy-third is the fact that the...
...the seventy-fourth is the fact that the...
...the seventy-fifth is the fact that the...
...the seventy-sixth is the fact that the...
...the seventy-seventh is the fact that the...
...the seventy-eighth is the fact that the...
...the seventy-ninth is the fact that the...
...the eightieth is the fact that the...
...the eighty-first is the fact that the...
...the eighty-second is the fact that the...
...the eighty-third is the fact that the...
...the eighty-fourth is the fact that the...
...the eighty-fifth is the fact that the...
...the eighty-sixth is the fact that the...
...the eighty-seventh is the fact that the...
...the eighty-eighth is the fact that the...
...the eighty-ninth is the fact that the...
...the ninetieth is the fact that the...
...the ninety-first is the fact that the...
...the ninety-second is the fact that the...
...the ninety-third is the fact that the...
...the ninety-fourth is the fact that the...
...the ninety-fifth is the fact that the...
...the ninety-sixth is the fact that the...
...the ninety-seventh is the fact that the...
...the ninety-eighth is the fact that the...
...the ninety-ninth is the fact that the...
...the hundredth is the fact that the...

the Act. It is a fair implication that except as provided by § 5 Congress intended the Old Georgetown Act to control.

The force of the Corporation Counsel's opinion in this respect is weakened by subsequent action taken by an agency of the District Commissioners, without objection by the Corporation Counsel, concerning the scope of the word "building" appearing in the Shipstead-Luce Act of May 16, 1930, 46 Stat. (Part I) 366, as amended, 53 Stat. 1144. In 1959 there was presented to the District of Columbia Board of Appeals and Review (established by Organization Order No. 112 of the Board of Commissioners of the District, dated August 11, 1955 (D.C. Code (1951) (Supp. VII), p. 89)), the question whether the jurisdiction of the Fine Arts Commission under the Shipstead-Luce Act extended to outdoor display signs. The Shipstead-Luce Act regulates the architecture of private and semipublic buildings adjacent to public buildings and grounds of major importance in the National Capital. Plans for the erection or alteration of "any building" in the area covered are required to be submitted to the Fine Arts Commission for recommendation insofar as they relate to height and appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction. Like the Old Georgetown Act signs are not specifically mentioned. Nevertheless, the Board of Appeals and Review on May 21, 1959, held that the Shipstead-Luce Act was applicable to signs, stating that the Corporation Counsel's opinion with respect to the Old Georgetown Act was distinguishable. (Docket No. M 858, Decision No. 917). Upon reference of this decision to the Corporation Counsel he did not undertake to review it as permitted by the District Commissioners' Order No. 58-2007, dated December 4, 1958, in cases in which he is not in accord

with the interpretation of the law made by the Board of Appeals and Review. I am not persuaded by the distinctions made by the Board. In my judgment, they do not justify differing interpretations of the word "building" appearing in both statutes.

Respectfully,

William P. Rogers
Attorney General



30000 0000000000
20 0000000000

27 January 1960

H. J. R. 1960

Dear General North:

At its meeting on January 19th, the Commission of Fine Arts viewed the photographs of the proposed sculptured eagles to be placed in the American Military Cemetery at Honolulu, Hawaii.

The members of the Commission considered that the problem had been satisfactorily solved and that the proposed sculpture would be a handsome addition to the monument.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

To establish a commission

Sincerely yours,

and to President Y

and other part

to provide ways and

David E. Finley
Chairman

Major General Thomas North
Secretary
American Battle Monuments
Commission
Washington 25, D. C.

1. To provide ways and

2. To provide ways and

3. That there is no

4. To provide ways and

5. To provide ways and

6. To provide ways and

I

EXHIBIT H

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 543

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 6, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey introduced the following joint resolution;
which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

JOINT RESOLUTION

To establish a commission to formulate plans for a living memorial to President Woodrow Wilson, President James Madison, and other past Presidents of the United States, and to provide ways and means of perpetuating our esteem for other distinguished citizens and avoid undue cluttering of the Nation's Capital with statues of the near-great and forgotten.

- 1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That there is hereby established a Commission, to be known
- 4 as the "Presidential Memorial Commission" (hereinafter
- 5 referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of con-
- 6 sidering and formulating plans for the design, construction,

1 conversion, and location, in the city of Washington, District
2 of Columbia, or in its immediate environs, of a permanent
3 living memorial, or memorials (including cultural facilities
4 befitting the capital city of a great nation and especially ap-
5 propriate to President Woodrow Wilson and President James
6 Madison who revered the fine arts) to President Woodrow
7 Wilson, President James Madison, and other past Presidents
8 of the United States. The Commission shall be composed of
9 twelve Commissioners appointed as follows: Four persons to
10 be appointed by the President of the United States, four Sen-
11 ators by the President of the Senate, and four Members of
12 the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House
13 of Representatives. The Commissioners shall serve without
14 compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred
15 by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission. The
16 Commission shall report such plans, together with its recom-
17 mendations, to the President and Congress at the earliest
18 practicable date, and in the interim shall make annual re-
19 ports of its progress to the President and Congress.

20 SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized —

21 (a) make such expenditures for personal services
22 and otherwise for the purpose of carrying out the pro-
23 visions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable
24 from funds appropriated or received as gifts for such
25 purpose;

1 (b) solicit and accept gifts to be used in carrying
2 out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used
3 in connection with the construction, conversion, or other
4 expenses of such living memorial or memorials;

5 (c) hold hearings, organize contests, enter into
6 contracts for personal services and otherwise, provide
7 ways and means of perpetuating our esteem for other
8 distinguished citizens besides our past Presidents and
9 avoid undue cluttering of the Nation's Capital with
10 statues of the near-great and forgotten, and do such
11 other things as may be necessary to carry out the pro-
12 visions of this joint resolution; and

13 (d) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the
14 Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Plan-
15 ning Commission, the District of Columbia Recreation
16 Board, the National Capital Regional Planning Council,
17 the National Park Service, the Bureau of International
18 Cultural Relations of the Department of State, specialists
19 in other Federal agencies, and such Commissions, Board,
20 Service, Bureau, Council, and specialists shall, upon re-
21 quest, render such assistance and advice.

22 SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such
23 sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this
24 joint resolution.

JOINT RESOLUTION

To establish a commission to formulate plans for a living memorial to President Woodrow Wilson, President James Madison, and other past Presidents of the United States, and to provide ways and means of perpetuating our esteem for other distinguished citizens and avoid undue cluttering of the Nation's Capital with statues of the near-great and forgotten.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey

JANUARY 6, 1960

Referred to the Committee on House Administration

NOTED
JAN 15 1960
RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION ON FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

1 March 1960

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing in reply to your request for the views of the Commission of Fine Arts with reference to H. J. Res. 543, "To establish a commission to formulate plans for a living memorial to President Woodrow Wilson, President James Madison, and other past Presidents of the United States, and to provide ways and means of perpetuating our esteem for other distinguished citizens and avoid undue cluttering of the Nation's Capital with statues of the near-great and forgotten."

The members of the Commission have studied the text of H. J. Res. 543, and unanimously agreed that they could not recommend its enactment into law. They feel that a monument to all Presidents of the United States would not be as satisfactory as the erection of individual monuments to outstanding and distinguished Presidents in response to general agreement that such monuments should be erected.

The plan of the city of Washington offers excellent sites for monuments, which are needed to complete its beauty as was intended by the civic planners and designers throughout the city's history. The fact that the United States has neglected to honor some of its outstanding Presidents with a monument in Washington would not justify, in our opinion, the erection of one monument in Washington to all Presidents and to other eminent officials and citizens. There are, as you know, plans for the erection of a monument to President Franklin D. Roosevelt; and for a monument on Theodore Roosevelt Island in honor of President Theodore Roosevelt; and legislation has been introduced for monuments to be erected in honor of President Woodrow Wilson and President James Madison.

There are, in addition, monuments to President Andrew Jackson and President James Garfield, as well as the great memorials to Presidents Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. It would not seem necessary on every occasion to erect a monument on such a vast scale as those to the three great Presidents last named.

The members of the Commission consider that a building or other public facility might be named in memory of an eminent official or citizen, but experience has proved that such structures outlive their usefulness and their dedicatory purpose is lost with the materials of their walls. The Commission of Fine Arts hopes that the custom of "useful" monuments will

never supplant memorials in bronze or stone of which there are so many outstanding examples in Washington.

The Commission, therefore, recommends that separate legislation be introduced for individual memorials to Presidents and other officials and citizens who have not yet been honored. The Commission will always be glad to render any service within its power in the selection of a site and design for the memorial.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Oscar Durlison
Chairman
Committee on House Administration
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

2/11/11

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 147

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 11, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

JOINT RESOLUTION

Providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Whereas the Congress established a permanent Commission of Fine Arts by the Act of May 10, 1910 (36 Stat. 371; 40 U.S.C. 104), to be composed of seven well-qualified judges of the fine arts to be appointed by the President and serve without pay for a period of four years each and until their successors are appointed and qualified, and whose duties are to advise generally upon questions of art when required to do so by the President or by any committee of either House of Congress; and

Whereas the duties of the said Commission have been further specified by Executive Order Numbered 1259, dated Octo-

I

EXHIBIT J

ber 25, 1910, directing that "Plans for no public buildings to be erected in the District of Columbia for the General Government shall be hereafter finally approved by the officer duly authorized until after such officer shall have submitted the plans to the Commission of Fine Arts for comment and advice."; and

Whereas Executive Order Numbered 1862, dated November 28, 1913, further specified that "whenever new structures are to be erected in the District of Columbia under the direction of the Federal Government which affect in any important way the appearance of the city, or whenever questions involving matters of art and with which the Federal Government is concerned are to be determined, final action shall not be taken until such plans and questions have been submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for comment and advice"; and

Whereas Executive Order Numbered 3524, dated July 28, 1921, directed that "essential matters relating to the design of medals, insignia, and coins produced by the executive departments, also the designs of statues, fountains, and monuments, and all important plans for parks and all public buildings, constructed by executive departments or the District of Columbia, which in any essential way affect the appearance of the city of Washington, or the District of Columbia, shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for advice as to the merits of such designs before the executive officer having charge of the same shall approve thereof"; and

Whereas the extent of the city of Washington has grown beyond the limits of the District of Columbia as specified in the above Act and Executive orders; and

Whereas many important decisions affecting the appearance of the city of Washington are made by Federal and District of Columbia Government officials without consulting the Commission of Fine Arts as provided above; and

Whereas recommendations of the Commission are advisory only:

Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That all officials of the United States and of the District of
4 Columbia charged, by Act of Congress or otherwise, with
5 responsibility for seeking advice and comment from the Com-
6 mission of Fine Arts shall consult with such Commission
7 in the early stages of matters with respect to which such
8 advice or comment is sought, before final decisions or plans
9 are made; and in any case in which any such official does not
10 carry out recommendations made by the Commission in giv-
11 ing advice or comment as requested, such official shall report
12 his reasons therefor, in writing, to the President of the United
13 States, the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and
14 House of Representatives, and the Committees on the Dis-
15 trict of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives.
16 The provisions of this joint resolution shall be applicable to
17 decisions of officials of the United States or of the District of
18 Columbia on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commis-
19 sion, as prescribed by law and Executive order, with respect

- 1 to parks and structures within the metropolitan area of the
- 2 District of Columbia in areas of Maryland and Virginia which
- 3 are adjacent to the District of Columbia.

86TH CONGRESS
2D Session

S. J. RES. 147

JOINT RESOLUTION

Providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Fulbright

JANUARY 11, 1960

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

NOTED
JAN 15 1960

22 January 1960

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I am writing in reply to your request for the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on S. J. Res. 117, 86th Congress, providing that the Commission of Fine Arts review advice and counsel on matters within the jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

The Commission of Fine Arts recommends that thoughtful action be taken by the Congress on the proposed legislation.

The past century has seen the expansion of the Washington Metropolitan Area beyond the boundaries fixed at the end of the eighteenth century for the District of Columbia. Parks have been established and buildings have been and are now being erected for the use of agencies of the Executive Branch of the Government outside the boundaries of the District of Columbia. Designs for such buildings are not being submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for advice, as is required by the present statute for proposed buildings within the District boundary line.

The Commission believes that the design and appearance of governmental buildings constructed beyond the District line are of equal importance with those built in the District of Columbia and should be subject to the same review on the part of the Commission of Fine Arts. The passage of the present legislation will make certain that the Commission will be given an opportunity to do this and to increase its usefulness to the government.

The Commission of Fine Arts was established by the Congress on May 17, 1910. The advice of the Presidential appointees, who have been and now are members of the Commission, has contributed to making Washington the dignified Seat of Government and beautiful city it is today. Over the fifty years of its existence, the Commission's advice has generally been taken by Federal and District officials. But today the value of building has greatly increased; and often decisions are made by contracting officers, who are not well-informed about the value of the Commission and the distinguished opinion that is available to them before contracts are let. In order that the government should have the benefit of the Commission's studies and recommendations, the action follows that,

Exhibit J-1

their accompanying officers discussed said recommendations, each officer should state their reasons in writing to The President and the Committee of Congress, as specified in this legislation.

The Senate at this point has indicated that it has no objection to the publication of this report and that it joins the Committee in recommending passage of S. R. 147.

For the Committee of The Senate

Wm. H. Taft

Wm. H. Taft
Chairman

Honorable George Charles
Chairman
Committee on Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 544

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 11, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey introduced the following joint resolution;
which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

JOINT RESOLUTION

Providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Whereas the Congress established a permanent Commission of Fine Arts by the Act of May 10, 1910 (36 Stat. 371; 40 U.S.C. 104), to be composed of seven well-qualified judges of the fine arts to be appointed by the President and serve without pay for a period of four years each and until their successors are appointed and qualified, and whose duties are to advise generally upon questions of art when required to do so by the President or by any committee of either House of Congress; and

Whereas the duties of the said Commission have been further specified by Executive Order Numbered 1259, dated Octo-

Exhibit J-2

ber 25, 1910, directing that "Plans for no public buildings to be erected in the District of Columbia for the General Government shall be hereafter fully approved by the officer duly authorized until after such officer shall have submitted the plans to the Commission of Fine Arts for comment and advice."; and

Whereas Executive Order Numbered 1862, dated November 28, 1913, further specified that "whenever new structures are to be erected in the District of Columbia under the direction of the Federal Government which affect in any important way the appearance of the city, or whenever questions involving matters of art and with which the Federal Government is concerned are to be determined, final action shall not be taken until such plans and questions have been submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts, for comment and advice"; and

Whereas Executive Order Numbered 3524, dated July 28, 1921, directed that "essential matters relating to the design of medals, insignia, and coins produced by the executive departments, also the designs of statues, fountains, and monuments, and all important plans for parks and all public buildings, constructed by executive departments or the District of Columbia, which in any essential way affect the appearance of the city of Washington, or the District of Columbia, shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for advice as to the merits of such designs before the executive officer having charge of the same shall approve thereof"; and

Whereas the extent of the city of Washington has grown beyond the limits of the District of Columbia as specified in the above Act and Executive orders; and

Whereas many important decisions affecting the appearance of the city of Washington are made by Federal and District of Columbia Government officials without consulting the Commission of Fine Arts as provided above; and

Whereas recommendations of the Commission are advisory only:

Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
 3 That all officials of the United States and of the District of
 4 Columbia charged, by Act of Congress or otherwise, with
 5 responsibility for seeking advice and comment from the
 6 Commission of Fine Arts shall consult with such Commis-
 7 sion in the early stages of matters with respect to which
 8 such advice or comment is sought, before final decisions or
 9 plans are made; and in any case in which any such official
 10 does not carry out recommendations made by the Commis-
 11 sion in giving advice or comment as requested, such official
 12 shall report his reasons therefor, in writing, to the President
 13 of the United States, the Committees on Public Works of
 14 the Senate and House of Representatives, and the Commit-
 15 tees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of
 16 Representatives. The provisions of this joint resolution shall
 17 be applicable to decisions of officials of the United States or
 18 of the District of Columbia on matters within the jurisdiction
 19 of the Commission, as prescribed by law and Executive

- 1 Order, with respect to parks and structures within the metro-
- 2 politan area of the District of Columbia in areas of Maryland
- 3 and Virginia which are adjacent to the District of Columbia.

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 544

JOINT RESOLUTION

Providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey

JANUARY 11, 1960

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

JAN 15 1960

25 January 1910

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing in reply to your request for the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on H.R. 306, 56th Congress, "providing that the Commission of Fine Arts regulate advice and consent on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

The Commission of Fine Arts recommends that favorable action be taken by the Congress on the proposed legislation.

The past century has seen the expansion of the Washington Metropolitan Area beyond the boundaries fixed at the end of the eighteenth century for the District of Columbia. Parks have been established and buildings have been and are now being erected for the use of agencies of the Executive Branch of the Government outside the boundaries of the District of Columbia. Designs for such buildings are not being submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for advice, as is required by the present statutes for proposed buildings within the District boundary line.

The Commission believes that the designs and appearance of governmental buildings constructed beyond the District line are of equal importance with those built in the District of Columbia and should be subject to the same review on the part of the Commission of Fine Arts. The passage of the present legislation will make certain that the Commission will be given an opportunity to do this and to increase its usefulness to the government.

The Commission of Fine Arts was established by the Congress on May 17, 1910. The advice of the Presidential appointees, who have been and now are members of the Commission, has contributed to making Washington the dignified seat of Government and beautiful city it is today. Over the fifty years of its existence, the Commission's advice has generally been taken by Federal and District Officials. Not only the value of building has greatly increased; and often decisions are made by contracting officers, who are not well informed as to the duties of the Commission and the considered opinion that is available to them before contracts are let. In order that the government should

Exhibit J-3

and the benefit of the Commission's studies and recommendations, the authors believe that when investigating officers disagree with recommendations, such officers should state their reasons in writing to the President and the Commission of Inquiry, as specified in this legislation.

At the request and invitation of the Commission, the authors of this report and their staff have been designated as members of the Commission of Inquiry.

For the Commission of Inquiry

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Charles A. Eshelby
Chairman
Committee on Public Works
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Reserving as public open space the area in the District of Columbia between E Street and Constitution Avenue and 23rd and 25th Streets, Northwest

WHEREAS, the area in the District of Columbia between E Street and Constitution Avenue and 23rd and 25th Streets, Northwest, designated on the original 1800 King Plans for the City of Washington as Appropriation No. 1, and as one of the highest points of land of the original city as contemplated by Pierre Charles L'Enfant; and

WHEREAS, because of its height it affords an unexcelled view of the Washington Monument and Potomac Park to the southeast and of the Potomac River and surrounding hills in Virginia to the south and west; and

WHEREAS, all of the early plans for the city, including the Ellicott Plan of 1800, designated its use as an open space of considerable prominence; and

WHEREAS, the construction of any governmental office or similar structure on this site would detract from the significance of the National Cultural Center and the Lincoln Memorial;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the area in the District of Columbia between E Street and Constitution Avenue and 23rd and 25th Streets, Northwest, shall be reserved for public open space and may be used only as a national monument or memorial site.

SEC. 2. No structure shall hereafter be constructed in the area, except monuments and memorials of such dimensions, including height, as will not detract from the use of the area as public open space or from the significance of the National Cultural Center and the Lincoln Memorial.

SEC. 3. Reservation of the area as public open space shall not preclude construction by the District of Columbia within the area of approaches to the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge, the West Leg of the Inner Loop, and roadways in connection therewith.

SEC. 4. Reservation of the area as public open space shall not preclude the construction of sewers, water mains, and other underground municipal utility lines deemed necessary by the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained herein shall limit the present use of the area, including proper maintenance of existing buildings, by the Department of the Navy and other agencies, provided, that no new buildings shall be constructed and no existing buildings shall be altered or removed, and provided further that existing buildings shall be vacated and removed as soon as reasonably feasible.

SEC. 6. Use of the area or any part thereof for monument or memorial purposes shall be in accordance with the recommendations of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Secretary of the Interior.

RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF WILLIAM DELANO

William Adams Delano, who died on January 12, 1960, at the age of 85, was one of the great figures among American Architects of the Twentieth Century. During the years in which he was most active, his creative talent and good judgment gave him wide influence in his profession and produced many monuments of lasting beauty. Of noteworthy value were his services in developing and preserving the beauty of the city of Washington, first with the Commission of Fine Arts and later with the National Capital Planning Commission. His life was an inspiration which will be cherished in memory.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

The history of the United States is a story of growth and development. It begins with the first settlers who came to the New World in search of a better life. They found a land of opportunity, but also a land of challenges. The early years were marked by struggle and hardship, but the spirit of the pioneers was strong. They built a nation that would stand the test of time. The story of the United States is a story of the American dream, of a land where anyone can make their fortune. It is a story of the values that have shaped the nation, of the ideals that have guided its progress. The history of the United States is a story of the people who have made it what it is today, a land of freedom and opportunity for all.